

Remarks

Applicant acknowledges **action items 1 and 2**, which appear not to require a response.

In response to action item 3: Amended to indicate continuation and incorporation by reference.

Applicant acknowledges **action item 4**, which appears not to require a response.

In response to action item 5: Applicant acknowledges that the legibility of text in drawings may have been reduced by the rendering of background patterns. Hence, newly amended drawings have white background in areas essential for understanding of the invention.

To action item 6: Hyperlinks removed.

To action items 7: Wording corrected from button to check box. Example given of key combination.

To action item 8: Acronyms defined.

To action item 9: Likeness of a person defined.

Applicant acknowledges **action item 10**, which forms the basis for action item 11.

In response to action item 11, regarding claim 1: Hildebrand discloses a graphical user interface without “one or more display regions for representation of the resource”, let alone “one or more display regions for normal size, legibly scaled, unabridged representation of the content of the resource”.

Hildebrand uses the term “group” as commonly used for “group of users”.

While Hildebrand para. 108 mentions the GUI 275 can be activated when a user finishes with a document, there is no reference to a document recognizable or present in Fig. 2D and none described in para. 108.

Hildebrand Fig. 2D apparently shows a GUI for editing group membership, to pick up users from group C and add them to group B. Supporting evidence includes but isn't limited to: Dialog title “AdmGrp : GUI”, field titles on left “Group to pickup users:” versus on right “Group to setup:”, respectively sitting on top of lists titled “User Names”, additional sections titled “Rights about other groups:” and “Default rights for files in this group:”, considering all mentions of “group” in the specification of Hildebrand are about “group of users”.

If Hildebrand doesn't disclose a user interface that is integrated with document representation then it cannot anticipate any claim dependent on claim 1.

To action item 11, further regarding claim 1: Hildebrand Fig. 2D has the appearance of a modal dialog, as used for access control settings in the popular Windows operating system, which is an obstacle to access control settings being “concurrently visible and concurrently operable” with document content navigation, viewing and editing.

The present invention allows to achieve high rates of correct decisions by operators in short time by not using modal dialogs, instead making available concurrent visibility and operability.

Such concurrent visibility and operability differentiates the present invention from any previously known system.

If Hildebrand doesn't disclose a user interface wherein the set of display regions for representations of the access control settings and the display region for representation of the content of the resource are concurrently visible and are concurrently operable then it cannot anticipate any claim dependent on claim 1.

To action item 11, regarding claim 2: Hildebrand in para. 108 explains check boxes 277 to determine rights, access privileges, how data can be accessed.

The Add and Delete button in Hildebrand Fig. 2D commonly and consistently with para. 108 would add and delete users to and from the group on the right, group B.

By those functions, Hildebrand does not modify the spatial layout of the dialog in Fig. 2D.

Those functions of Hildebrand do not compare to the functionality of the present invention as described in this disclosure for buttons 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, which add and remove concurrently visible regions with access control information, which is shown in Figures 9 to 23 to modify the spatial layout of the display regions, specifically explained from Figures 20 to 23.

To action item 11, regarding claim 3: Similar to response to claim 2, Hildebrand does not modify the number of display regions.

Hildebrand para. 135 and Fig. 5B.1 discuss rights, access privileges, but not changes to numbers of display regions in user interface as described in this disclosure.

To action item 11, regarding claim 4: The present invention defines “transformation” to be used to project from the theoretical space of access control settings into the mathematical space of graphical user interface.

There is no discussion of such transformations in Hildebrand.

There is no discussion of using more than one transformation in Hildebrand.

In the present invention “transformation” doesn’t mean to change access control settings.

Consistent with its definition, in this disclosure Figure 25 shows different transformations applied to the same structured data.

To action item 11, regarding claim 7: As discussed above, in Hildebrand Fig. 2D there is no reference to a document recognizable or present, it appears to show a GUI for editing group membership, to pick up users from group C and add them to group B.

Hildebrand Fig. 2E is a theoretical drawing and isn’t shown to the operator in a user interface.

Hildebrand Fig. 2E is a visual aid to the language based effort in para. 110 to explain how access levels in an embodiment apply to files in a hierarchy of directories, and yet Fig. 2E is unable to explain by itself and doesn’t show an important aspect of Hildebrand para. 110, “that a user with access level A authorization can access not only access A items but also the lower access levels B and C which are subsets of access level A.”

Hildebrand Fig. 2E fails at an essential aspect of the present invention, it fails at clearly showing who is allowed to access a document.

Hildebrand Fig. 2E doesn’t show corresponding sets of individual users for anything.

Hildebrand Fig. 5B.1 as explained in para. 135 for “group C” shows access privileges, yet without showing the corresponding set of individual users, thus Fig. 5B.1 fails at an essential aspect of claim 7.

Hildebrand para. 102 discusses Fig. 2C.1, which is a theoretical drawing about the encoding of information within a document and isn’t shown to the operator in a user interface.

Hildebrand in no single figure, let alone in any figure shown to the operator in a user interface, discloses the very specific combinations of claim 7.

Many access control systems perform calculations, but the present invention differs from previously known systems by presenting specifically well chosen combined sets of information and results of calculations to the operator.

To action item 11, regarding claim 8: If Hildebrand doesn't disclose a user interface that is integrated with document representation then it cannot anticipate any claim dependent on claim 1.

If Hildebrand doesn't disclose concurrent visibility and operability then it cannot anticipate any claim dependent on claim 1.

To action item 11, regarding claim 33: If Hildebrand doesn't disclose a user interface that is integrated with document representation then it cannot anticipate any claim dependent on claim 1.

If Hildebrand doesn't disclose concurrent visibility and operability then it cannot anticipate any claim dependent on claim 1.

To action item 12: Applicant acknowledges 35 U.S.C. 103(a), which forms the basis for action items 13, 14, 15 and 16.

Examiner agrees actually only one inventor has been named.

To action item 13, regarding claim 5: Bhetanabhotla concerns itself with photos as part of collections of information, with an emphasis on one element being part of more than one collection, photos as elements of photo albums, e.g. photos of families on vacation in an amusement park.

Bhetanabhotla does not suggest identifying a person by a photo id.

Photos of the quality and nature as commonly used in contexts described by Bhetanabhotla are not fit for use as photo id for the present invention.

Bhetanabhotla does not describe using a single photo to identify one person, let alone for access control purposes.

To action item 13, regarding claim 9: As explained above, Hildebrand cannot anticipate any claim dependent on claim 1.

Bhetanabhotla para. 123 and Fig. 1 may describe layout of representations of resources, for which there are other examples in the art, but there is no precedent for using layouts for representations of access control settings that control access to resources as in the present invention in order to achieve better results in professionals using access control.

A indication of contemporary art in user interface for access control is Bhetanabhotla Fig. 11 for an access control user interface and its description.

The Bhetanabhotla access control window Fig. 11 lacks essential features of the present invention.

To action item 14, regarding claim 10: Hildebrand Fig. 2C.1 isn't a user interface element, instead it is a structure inside a document, an encoding in a file.

The present invention specifically innovates in making access control settings visible, which prior art has failed at doing, hence a drawing that shows internal workings of access control mechanisms but that isn't presented to the operator shouldn't be considered leading to obviousness, specifically in a time when "hiding internal workings" is the preeminent practice in the art.

Sekiguchi concerns itself with determining whether access by a user to a variety of resources is normal, by statistical analysis of access.

Sekiguchi doesn't show user interface for logs.

Sekiguchi doesn't show the collection of information about access by all users for one specific resource, neither to any user nor internally in processing.

Sekiguchi doesn't suggest display of access logs to an operator.

Sekiguchi only outputs alarms to operators.

Sekiguchi discussion of logs is purely internal to processing mechanisms and isn't exposed to an operator in user interface.

Hildebrand doesn't disclose logging information being made available to an operator in a user interface other than a restrictive mention referring Fig. 5A in para. 147 "The access report manager 518 is preferably activated by the system administrator and the contents gathered in the access report manager 518 shall be only accessed by the system administrator or with authority."

Claim 10 lists specific information to be displayed that matters in professional workflow, with such specific information being mentioned neither in Hildebrand nor in Sekiguchi nor in any other known work.

Claim 10 lists "indication whether the most recent read access by the user to the resource has been before the most recent write access by any user to the resource", which tells whether the user only has read an outdated version and hence has different information than other team members, which is mentioned neither in Hildebrand nor in Sekiguchi nor in any other known work.

Claim 10 lists “indication whether the user currently is without read privilege for the resource”, which is significant for rapid comprehension of security circumstances when people who have lost access rights nevertheless correctly are listed for past instances of access, which at a past time had been authorized access, which is mentioned neither in Hildebrand nor in Sekiguchi nor in any other known work.

This disclosure further shows examples of user interface that are extremely comprehensible to a professional in a field other than software (e.g. comprehensible to a medical doctor) and in contrast to any prior art, with various deficiencies of prior art refuting the idea that claim 10 would have been obvious to an artisan at the time the invention was made.

Applicant wants this paragraph to acknowledge appreciation for the difficulty of having to find prior art specifically when there isn't a close match.

Some references cited in the office action cannot be seen as relevant, specifically in the context in which they are cited, yet as pointing out irrelevance can become a lengthy and wordy exercise, applicant refrains from attempting to describe lack of connection and would rather recommend applying various techniques of reading cited patent applications in order to gain understanding of what they are saying.

To action item 14, regarding claim 11: Hildebrand doesn't teach that anyone would want to see or how to display or that one could or should compute for a resource the set created through the union of the set of users allowed to access the resource now with the set of users who have access the resource in the past, which may include users who have lost access rights, and Hildebrand doesn't teach displaying or computing an access log for the resource for that set of users, let alone with specific indications listed in claim 10.

To action item 14, regarding claim 12: Sekiguchi doesn't teach that anyone would want to see or how to display access logs concurrently with the contents of a resource, let alone concurrently visible and concurrently operable.

To action item 14, regarding claim 28: If Hildebrand in view of Sekiguchi fails to make obvious and render unpatentable claim 10 then they cannot make obvious and render unpatentable any claim dependent on claim 10.

Examiner has replaced citation (paras. 0013-0016) with (col. 5, lines 14-55; Figs. 3-5).

To action item 14, regarding claim 30: Hildebrand doesn't teach that anyone would want to see or how to display or that one could or should compute for a resource the set created through the union of the set of users allowed to access the resource now with the set of users who have access the resource in the past, which may include users who have lost access rights, and Hildebrand doesn't teach displaying or computing an access log for the resource for that set of users, let alone with specific indications listed in claim 10, let alone concurrently with the contents of a resource, let alone concurrently visible and concurrently operable.

To action item 14, regarding claim 31: If Hildebrand and Sekiguchi fail to make obvious and render unpatentable claims 10 and 12 then then they cannot make obvious and render unpatentable any claim dependent on claim 12.

To action item 15, regarding claim 6: Steinberg concerns itself with correction of colors in digital image files to match the true object the image has been taken of, using a color matching technique involving a color chart for creating a profile for correcting for the difference between the color chart and a recorded image from a camera and then applying the created profile for identically adjusting a sequence of images from the same camera.

In contrast, the present invention concerns itself with adjusting any image from any source towards predetermined (considered ideal) color space values (not trying to match the true object an image has been taken of) in order to achieve evenly patterned appearance of graphical representations of collections comprising users, for that purpose moving each image whatever image necessitated direction and size increments along the axes of a color space and other image parameters (some of which might not be considered color space axes) to get to ideal values.

In other words, simplified for comparison, Steinberg once determines how much a camera is off and then adjust all images the same to compensate for the camera being off so and so much, while in contrast the present invention makes all images look similar so that a collection of images looks evenly patterned.

Steinberg doesn't mention masking to a shape to get resulting images, and the use of a shape in Steinberg para. 31 is for a different purpose in the process of generating a profile for a camera.

To action item 16, regarding claims 29 and 32: Bhetanabhotla teaches putting photos into categories in order to organize them, but doesn't teach making a single photo, let alone an ID photo, a designated attribute of a user of the system.

Bhetanabhotla doesn't teach a graphical user interface where a user is represented in part by a likeness of the user, but Bhetanabhotla teaches a system where multiple photos can be categorized as information items in a category that happens to be named the same as or similar to a user.

Bhetanabhotla teaches categories need to be created first and named at will before photos can be classified (paras. 125-126), e.g. categories Max, Pam, Sue and Vic in Fig. 1, and notably quite unrelated the owner of the information collection must define login names and passwords (para. 160, Fig. 11).

Bhetanabhotla describes when a photo frame is defined (para. 146) a title can be specified and multiple photos can be selected for display in a page, which further indicates not only are categories not linked to login names but also the titles of photo frames (180 in Fig. 1) haven't automatically been created and aren't in a significant way linked to the categories (150 in Fig. 1).

Hence for the purpose of a functioning access control system where a user is represented by a display element comprising a likeness of the user, Bhetanabhotla doesn't teach a user interface where a user of the system is represented by an display element comprising a likeness of the user, but Bhetanabhotla only teaches an otherwise pleasant or useful but for this purpose insufficient user interface where any number of stored photos for display at will each can be given a title that contains a sequence of characters that are the same as login names.

Many photo album softwares exist in the art, but none allows a user to restrict access to images by using ID photos of other users.

If Hildebrand in view of Sekiguchi fails to make obvious and render unpatentable claim 10 then they cannot make obvious and render unpatentable any claim dependent on claim 10.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leo Baschy/

Leo Baschy

Applicant Pro Se

Date 2008-04-07